

REMARKS

Status of Application

Claims 1-8, 12-18 and 22 are all the claims pending in the present Application. Claims 1, 12, and 22 are amended. Claims 9-11, 19-21 and 23 are hereby canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Spaulding

Claims 1-3, 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,822,451 to Spaulding et al. ("Spaulding"). Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In the Response to Arguments portion of the instant Office Action, the Examiner states that "Applicant's claim 1 does not clearly necessitate that threshold values for all colors are generated from an input value for one color. . . . This recitation is broad enough to be interpreted as reciting generation of a mask threshold from a respective stored mask threshold value, and this generation is performed for each of the color channels." (Office Action at 2, 3.)

In the interest of further clarification, claims 1 and 12 are amended to require "generating respective mask threshold values for each of a plurality of color channels based on said received respective stored mask threshold value." Applicant respectfully submits that this language clearly indicates that "threshold values for each of a plurality of color channels" are generated based on a particular value.

As stated in the Amendment filed on September 26, 2007, Spaulding fails to disclose this element of independent claims 1 and 12. Spaulding, therefore, fails to anticipate these claims.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1 and 12, and their dependent claims 2, 3, and 13.

Shu

Claims 9-11, 19-21 and 23 stand rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,768,411 to Shu et al. ("Shu"). Claims 9-11, 19-21, and 23 are canceled, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Spaulding

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Spaulding. Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Certain deficiencies of Spaulding with respect to independent claim 12 are set forth above. Amended claim 22 recites features similar to those of claim 12. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 22 is also patentable at least for reasons analogous to those set forth above with respect to claim 12. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Spaulding in view of Young

Claims 4, 5, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Spaulding in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,154,195 to Young et al. ("Young"). Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 4, 5, 14, and 15 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1 and 12. Certain deficiencies of Spaulding with respect to independent claims 1 and 12 are set forth above, which the alleged teachings of Young fail to remedy. Thus, Spaulding and Young, alone

or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 4, 5, 14, and 15.

The cited references, therefore, fail to render these claims unpatentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Spaulding in view of Shu

Claims 6-8 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Spaulding in view of Shu. Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 6-8 and 16-18 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1 and 12. Certain deficiencies of Spaulding with respect to independent claims 1 and 12 are set forth above, which the alleged teachings of Shu fail to remedy. Thus, Spaulding and Shu, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 6-8 and 16-18. The cited references, therefore, fail to render these claims unpatentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter A. McKenna
Registration No. 38,551

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 6, 2008